

**BEFORE**  
**THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF**  
**SOUTH CAROLINA**  
**DOCKET NO. 2017-292-WS**

**Blue Granite Water Company**  
**Compliance Filing**  
**Customer Complaint Resolution Report**  
September 21, 2018 – March 29, 2019

---

On May 30, 2018, the South Carolina Public Service Commission (“the Commission” or “PSC”) approved Blue Granite Water Company’s, (“BGWC” or “the Company”), formerly known as Carolina Water Service, Inc., request for an increase in general rates and charges for its water and sewer services. As part of its Order, the PSC provided that:

“...in order to ensure that the Company is being responsive to quality of service issues, and to its customers, BGWC shall prepare a report and submit it to the Commission and to ORS no less than semiannually, and the document should have headings for ‘Customer Complaint,’ ‘Company Response,’ ‘Customer Reaction to Company,’ and explain the Company reaction to Customer Complaints during the period addressed, along with any explanations regarding quality of service.”

The following report provides not only the information requested by the PSC but also metrics from BGWC’s call center operations for the second two quarters of 2018 to give a more in-depth view of the Company’s efforts to be responsive to its customers. This report contains details concerning (i) Customer Billing, (ii) Call Center Operations, (iii) Customer Complaints, and (iv) Escalated Customer Complaints and Resolutions.

The reporting period for this report is September 21, 2018 through March 29, 2019.

**Chart 1: Customer Billing** – This chart provides details on the number of bills issued each month and the accuracy of those bills. It also provides the average time it took to resolve bills that were in error.

## Customer Billing

Performance Metrics	Jul Actual	Aug Actual	Sep Actual	3Q18 Actual	Oct Actual	Nov Actual	Dec Actual	4Q18 Actual	YTD
# of Bills Rendered	21531	21559	21665	64755	21529	21600	21400	64529	258093
% of Billing Accuracy	99.8%	99.8%	99.9%	99.8%	99.9%	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%
Summary of Causes of Billing Adjustments									
Billed in Error	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	31
Rate Change	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Wrong Bill Cycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wrong Customer Billed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wrong Period Billed	0	5	3	8	0	3	1	4	35
Wrong Rate	2	0	0	2	3	2	0	5	8
Wrong Read	33	46	28	107	18	44	35	97	446
# of Billing Exceptions	444	593	479	1516	565	251	251	1067	4476
Avg # of Days to Resolve Billing Exceptions	12.02	7.67	4.21	7.97	8.10	7.10	10.38	8.53	5.48

**Chart 2: Call Center Operations** – This chart provides details on how responsive customer service representatives are in handling calls. It includes the number of calls received each month and how quickly those calls are answered.

## Call Center Operations

Performance Metrics	Jul Actual	Aug Actual	Sep Actual	3Q18 Actual	Oct Actual	Nov Actual	Dec Actual	4Q18 Actual	YTD
# of Calls Received at all Centers	3528	4268	3041	10837	3624	4002	3555	11181	44565
*Average Speed of Answer / Service Level	84.9%	80.7%	82.4%	82.7%	82.2%	86.1%	82.1%	83.4%	82.9%
Abandon Rate	2.7%	2.5%	2.6%	2.6%	2.1%	1.7%	2.0%	1.9%	2.7%
Longest Wait Time in Queue	0:04:53	0:05:02	0:05:00	0:05:02	0:05:18	0:05:05	0:13:13	0:13:13	0:18:54
Average Wait Time	0:00:32	0:00:43	0:00:43	0:00:39	0:00:40	0:00:29	0:00:36	0:00:35	0:00:40
Average Customer Treatment Time	0:10:03	0:09:43	0:10:11	0:09:59	0:09:56	0:07:32	0:07:50	0:08:26	0:07:03

\*The Company is reporting against a Target Average Speed of Answer Service Level of 80% of all calls answered within 60 seconds of entering queue. The Company has been performing at this level since 01/01/2013.

**Chart 3: Customer Complaints** – This chart provides details on the actual complaints received from customers and the reasons for the complaints. The complaint rate is measured by dividing the number of complaints by the number of active customer accounts. These complaints are considered resolved unless they are either escalated to the Community Relations Coordinator or a complaint comes through the ORS for investigation by the Community Relations Coordinator. See Chart 4 for those complaints.

## Customer Complaints

Performance Metrics	Jul Actual	Aug Actual	Sep Actual	3Q18 Actual	Oct Actual	Nov Actual	Dec Actual	4Q18 Actual	YTD
# of Complaints Received	251	307	299	857	402	302	289	993	3198
% of Unresolved Complaints Issued Notice to Contact ORS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Complaint Rate	1.17%	1.43%	1.39%	1.33%	1.85%	1.39%	1.33%	1.52%	1.05%
Types and Number of Types of Calls Received from BGWC Customers									
High Bill Investigation	53	96	81	230	163	92	89	344	824
Air in Water	0	2	0	2	0	3	5	8	22
Clogged Sewer	7	8	5	20	10	14	12	36	148
Discolored Water	14	12	9	35	7	11	19	37	116
General Inves igation	44	46	39	129	52	34	36	122	470
High or Low Pressure in the Water	26	15	23	64	19	15	18	52	223
Lawn Repair for Sewer Breaks	1	2	0	3	1	5	0	6	15
Lawn Repair for Water Breaks	1	6	2	9	5	5	1	11	35
Lift Station Problems	1	0	1	2	5	0	1	6	13
Mineral Amount in Water	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	3
No Water	28	21	41	90	21	20	27	68	340
Noise in Sewer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Odor in Sewer	0	1	0	1	3	0	2	5	12
Repair/Replace Meter Box	3	1	4	8	5	3	1	9	33
Repair Road	0	2	2	4	4	5	3	12	20
Sewer Main Break	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Sewer Miscellaneous Complaint	9	12	6	27	14	13	21	48	136
Sewer Service Line Break	1	2	1	4	6	0	0	6	30
Taste or Odor in the Water	6	6	5	17	7	2	2	11	42
Water Quality	2	4	2	8	2	4	0	6	31
Water Main Break	8	10	11	29	11	10	8	29	88
Water Miscellaneous Complaint	9	17	10	36	19	17	11	47	165
Water Service Line Break	32	32	45	109	34	33	26	93	323
Test Meter	6	12	11	29	13	15	7	35	98

**Chart 4: Escalated Customer Complaints and Resolutions** – This chart provides details on all the calls that are either escalated by BGWC Customer Service to the Community Relations Coordinator for resolution or through a complaint received by a customer through the ORS. Pursuant to the Commission’s Order No. 2018-345(A) in Docket No. 2017-292-WS, the chart below provides the customer complaint, Company response, customer reaction and resolution date. The Company began tracking these complaints as of the Order date, May 30, 2018. The reporting period for this report is September 22, 2018 through March 29, 2019.

### Escalated Customer Complaints and Resolutions

Customer Name	Customer Complaint	Company Response	Customer Reaction	Resolution Date
	requested a leak [REDACTED] and submitted correct paperwork. He didn’t hear anything back.	BGWC provided a courtesy leak adjustment. A payment arrangement was set up to pay the remaining balance.	spoke with Michael Cartin and Reese Hannon at a customer workshop and was happy with the agreement.	11/2/2018
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> [REDACTED] stated that their meter was exchanged because there was no reading. The customer also stated that she was overbilled for a location that was vacant.	BGWC found that the account was not overcharged. The meter was replaced because the meter could not be read. BGWC credited this account \$40 to account for the reconnect fee. BGWC had registered meter reads during this time which indicates the home was not vacant.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	11/19/2018
[REDACTED]	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> [REDACTED] called to dispute a high bill. The customer was seeking an adjustment for the overage they were billed.	The customer's meter was sent for testing and it was determined that the meter was running slow, in favor of the customer. No adjustment was given to [REDACTED]	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	11/28/2018

██████████	<p><u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ stated that he received a 6-page bill with a \$2,000 amount due.</p>	<p>BGWC found that it had back billed this customer's account because the account was not reactivated after the switch to water only accounts for I-20 residents. BGWC canceled the back bills and the customer was only billed for usage in October. The customer also had a DPA which was a result of a previous large balance.</p>	<p>This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol. A customer service representative spoke with ██████████ about the arrangement and explained the process.</p>	11/28/2018
██████████	<p><u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ stated that she paid \$90.97 on 12/10/18 and her water service was terminated on 12/13/18. ██████████ stated that upon contacting BGWC she was told that her service was terminated because she failed to call in a confirmation number for payment to the Company prior to termination. She also stated the BGWC would not reconnect her service without her paying the \$40.00 reconnect fee.</p>	<p>BGWC's protocol is to call and provide a confirmation number after payment is made to avoid disconnection. When the confirmation number is received, dispatch is called and notified to not disconnect the customer. Because the confirmation number was not given, our technicians were not notified and turned off service. BGWC decided to waive the \$40.00 reconnect fee for inconvenience. The customer was told to call and provide the confirmation number when she made the payment in the future.</p>	<p>This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.</p>	12/27/2018
██████████	<p><u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ stated that he is being overcharged as a result of incorrect meter readings.</p>	<p>BGWC found that there was an error with this customer's bill. The customer was overcharged for 5,380 gallons due to an office estimate. The bill should have been for \$111.09 and instead, it was calculated at \$160.73. The customer's account was credited for the difference, which was \$49.64 on December 13, 2018.</p>	<p>This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.</p>	12/27/2018

██████████	<p><u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ called to dispute a high bill.</p>	<p>BGWC found that ██████████ was correct in her dispute of the high bill. The usage on the bill was made by a system estimate that estimated larger than the customer's average usage. Upon finding the issue, the bill was cancelled, and a new bill based on her usage was mailed to the customer. The bill came out to \$30.60. This account adjustment took place on 12/27/2018.</p>	<p>The Company spoke with Ms. ██████████ to let her know what happened and the customer was pleased with the resolution. This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.</p>	12/28/2018
██████████	<p><u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ stated that he was constantly double-billed and was made to pay twice in December of 2017. ██████████ believed that all of his bills are estimated, and he has never paid for actual usage.</p>	<p>BGWC found that ██████████ had not been double-billed. On several occasions, ██████████ only paid a partial amount of his total bill, and the remainder was then added to the next bill. ██████████ was not double-billed in December, but his bill dated 11/27/2017 was added to the bill dated 12/27/2017, as there was no payment made between bills. BGWC did, however, test the meter and found it to be running fast. ██████████ account was credited an amount of \$27.49 to reflect the results of the test. Since the beginning of 2018, ██████████ has been billed for actual usage each month.</p>	<p>This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.</p>	1/3/2019
██████████ ██████████	<p><u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ called to complain about water interruptions on the Company well. The customer loses water every time there is a flicker or if the power goes out.</p>	<p>BGWC found that this system does not have a hydrotank in place, which would prevent this issue from happening. Without a hydrotank, when the power flickers or goes out, it trips the booster pumps and they must be manually reset. BGWC is currently investigating this issue and will look to find a prudent solution.</p>	<p>This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.</p>	1/10/2019

██████████ ██████████	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ stated that he pulled up to his house and was met with a BGWC representative plugging his sewer. ██████████ stated that he was unaware that BGWC was his service provider, as he believed his water and sewer were provided by the City of Columbia. ██████████ is frustrated that he never got a bill or notification that BGWC was his sewer provider, that his bill was past due, or a disconnection notice.	BGWC found that ██████████ had not created an account with BGWC as his sewer provider. A vacancy survey was completed in this area and the Company determined that no account was setup. A door tag was left on this customer's door letting him know that he needed to setup an account with us or sewer service would be disconnected. The customer did not set up an account with us and was disconnected on 12/2/2018. The customer then called to setup an account and was reconnected the same day. The customer was not back billed for any previous service.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	1/11/2019
██████████	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ received a bill in August for \$300, and it was determined that she had a leak. The leak was quickly repaired. She received a normal bill in September and another large bill in October.	BGWC found that ██████████ was due a courtesy leak adjustment of \$352.42. ██████████ meter was tested, and the meter failed in favor of the customer.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	1/16/2019
██████████	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ called to dispute a high bill.	BGWC found that the high bill in question was due to customer usage. The meter was tested and the it came back with an accuracy rating of 99.2%. BGWC sent this customer Leak Adjustment forms in case a leak occurred during this time.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	1/23/2019
██████████ ██████████	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ of ██████████ called to complain about a delay in connection of service.	BGWC found that our field staff and contractor got behind schedule, which resulted in the delay in connection of service. BGWC Area Manager ██████████ contacted ██████████ to coordinate installation of the taps. All taps were installed by Thursday, 1/25/2019.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	1/25/2019



	<p><u>ORS Complaint:</u> [REDACTED] stated that her account is on auto-draft and is paid each month as required by the payment arrangement. [REDACTED] stated that the Company advised her that service has been off for three weeks, but she states that it was not terminated until 1/25/19. [REDACTED] stated that she had no prior notice of terminating service. She also stated that the Company advised her she would need to pay \$1,000.00 to get service reconnected.</p>	<p>BGWC found that this customer was cut for nonpayment on 1/22/2019. The customer was sent three disconnect notices on dates: 10/30/2018, 11/13/2018, and 12/17/2018. These notices let the customer know that she owed \$276.80 to avoid disconnection. The customer paid a total of \$300.00 on 1/25/2019, and service was restored. Her remaining balance at that time was \$50.16.</p>	<p>This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.</p>	<p>2/1/2019</p>
	<p><u>ORS Complaint:</u> [REDACTED] contacted BGWC to inquire about having her service disconnected, as the property is currently vacant. A customer service representative advised her that should she reconnect the service within six months of disconnection, she would be charged a reconnection fee and billed a pro-rated amount of \$65.77 for each month she has been without service for that six-month time period.</p>	<p>Reese Hannon reached out to the customer service representative to find out what was explained to the customer. Upon investigation it was found that the customer service representative made a mistake in relaying this information. The customer would not be back billed for time when service is disconnected.</p>	<p>This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.</p>	<p>2/1/2019</p>
	<p>[REDACTED] emailed Reese Hannon to inquire about an extremely high bill.</p>	<p>BGWC found that this customer's meter was stuck, and an operator hit the meter until it started spinning again. Because BGWC was unsure of the result of restarting the meter in that way, a credit of \$637.02 and a payment arrangement was made with the customer.</p>	<p>Reese Hannon contacted the customer the let her know the arrangement and a Customer Service Representative also contacted the customer. She was happy with the arrangement.</p>	<p>2/6/2019</p>

██████████	██████████ was credited \$120.89 for a faulty meter. She was not happy with the credit adjustment because she had one month of extremely high usage, unusual for her home.	BGWC found that the customer's meter was not configured correctly in the system. Upon consideration a \$330 credit was due to this issue.	Reese Hannon spoke with the customer to explain the issue, and the customer was happy with the arrangement.	2/20/2019
██████████	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ disputed three months of high bills. The location in question is a rental property and he kept his name on the water service account.	BGWC found that this customer's meter was stuck and when the meter was replaced, it registered actual usage. The tenants used the water in question. Since ██████████ was not responsible for the usage, BGWC gave the customer a credit that only left the customer responsible for \$1,000. The customer also agreed to change the water service out of his name and into the name of the tenants in order to avoid future issues.	Michael Cartin and Reese Hannon spoke with this customer to make this arrangement. The customer was happy with the result. This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	2/26/2019
██████████	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ called to inquire about a sewer backup at her home. The county Sherriff instructed her to call ORS.	BGWC found that the sewer backup was on the customer side of the line. BGWC Area Manager, Randall Plummer spoke with the customer to explain the problem. Once she understood the issue, the customer felt better. BGWC fixed the tap and moved the elder valve further into this customer's yard to help prevent any future problems.	This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	2/28/2019
██████████	<u>ORS Complaint:</u> ██████████ called to determine if his service had been terminated or not. ██████████ previously attempted to setup payment arrangements with BGWC but never agreed on an affordable arrangement.	██████████ service was terminated on 2/12/2019 due to non-payment. Reese Hannon reached out to the customer and offered a payment arrangement of \$300 down, \$100 plus the regular monthly bill and no reconnect fee. Mr. ██████████ paid \$300 on 3/1/2019 and service was restored.	Reese Hannon spoke with ██████████ and the customer was happy with the arrangement. This complaint came through the ORS, so they handled the complaint. After investigating, the Company provided its response to the ORS. They in turn provided a response to the customer per protocol.	3/1/2019

██████████	<u>ORS Inquiry:</u> ██████████ wrote ORS to inquire about the Company's base facilities charge. ██████████ believed she was being charged over the approved amount.	BGWC found that this customer was referencing the tariff and thought they were in Service Territory 1, which means the base facilities charge would be \$16.82. The customer is actually located in Service Territory 2, which means the base facilities charge is \$28.59. This customer was being charged the correct amount.	Michael Cartin called this customer to explain.	3/13/2019
------------	---	---	---	-----------